



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,847	03/12/2001	Gerd Mansfeld	Mo-6209/HR-183	1134
157	7590	05/28/2004	EXAMINER	
BAYER POLYMERS LLC 100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH, PA 15205			JOHNSON, EDWARD M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1754	
DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/762,847	MANSFELD ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Edward M. Johnson	1754	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2004.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-24 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-11 and 13-24 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 4 and 12 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, and 13-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshida et al. US 4,487,613.

Regarding claims 1 and 18-19, Yoshida '613 discloses a method for odorization of hydrocarbon gases comprising combination of 2-methoxy-3-isobutyl pyrazine and methyl acrylate (see columns 5 and 6, Formulas) as a warning agent for hydrocarbon fuels (see abstract).

Regarding claims 9, 21-22, and 24 Yoshida '613 discloses a composition for odorization of hydrocarbon gases comprising combination of 2-methoxy-3-isobutyl pyrazine and methyl acrylate (see columns 5 and 6, Formulas).

Regarding claims 5 and 13, Yoshida discloses addition of 2-methyl-3-isobutyl pyrazine (see column 6, lines 56-61).

Regarding claims 6-7 and 14-15, 0.5 parts pyrazine to 100 parts methyl acrylate (see columns 5-6, Formulas).

Regarding claims 16-17, Yoshida '613 discloses low corrosivity (see column, line 17).

Regarding claims 20 and 23, Yoshida '613 discloses the compounds as a warning agent for hydrocarbon fuels (see abstract).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-3 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida '613.

Regarding claims 2-3 and 10-11, Yoshida fails to specifically disclose 2 different acrylic esters.

It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use ethyl acrylate in combination with the methyl acrylate of Yoshida because Yoshida discloses combinations of ethyl acrylate useful for odorization (see column 1, lines 14-16 and 64-68; column 2, lines 1-6).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 4 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the weight ratio of 9:1 to 1:9 of the two acrylic esters in an amount effective to warn of presence in the method of imparting odor to an odorless combustible gas of the instant claims 4 and 12.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3/26/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is argued that applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended herein... sulfides (see Abstract). This is not persuasive because Yoshida discloses addition of mercaptan "and/or", 2-methyl-3-isobutyl pyrazine, which also anticipates the pyrazine by itself. Yoshida also discloses as much as 95% of this compound, wherein as little as 0.5% mixture containing mercaptan is used (see column 4, lines 27-31). Lastly, Applicant merely claims the components are "substantially" sulfur-free,

which does not preclude the presence of mercaptans entirely, as Applicant appears to suggest.

**Conclusion**

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward M. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1352. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley S. Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-0987.

EMJ  
May 26, 2004

